

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 1971

I. Session called to order in the Staff Dining Room by Chairman Will Alexander at 3:10 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

Members:

W. Alexander	M. Gold	M. O'Leary	H. Scales
A. Andreoli	D. Grant	B. Olsen	H. Smith
W. Boyce	S. Harden	R. Pautz	M. Smith
M. Brady	D. Head	J. Peterson	J. Stuart
W. Brown	H. Honegger	C. Quinlan	D. Stubbs
S. Burroughs	C. Johnson	R. Ratcliffe	L. Voss
R. Burton	T. Johnston	H. Rhoads	J. Weatherby
R. Carruthers	L. Labhard	W. Rice	R. Wheeler
R. Cleath	A. Landyshev	H. Rickard	M. Whitson
F. Clogston	J. Lowry	R. Ritschard	M. Wilks
D. Federer	J. Mott	J. Rogalla	
R. Frost	D. Nickell	A. Rosen	

Guests:

C. Beymer D. Coats

Ex-Officio (Voting) Members:

G. Clucas	J. Ericson	A. Higdon	T. Turkovich
C. Cummins	C. Gibson	P. Banke	

III. MSC for approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 12, 1971, as corrected.

IV. Business Items

A. Personnel Policies Committee - H. Rhoads moved that

The Academic Senate recommend to the President that the "Consultative Procedures in Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion," as submitted by the Personnel Policies Committee in its report dated January 29, 1971, be adopted as College policy. (See Attachment A, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

MSC (H. Rhoads, sec. W. Boyce) for adoption by a vote of 42 for, 2 against, 9 abstentions.

MSC (J. Lowry, sec. J. Stuart) that the words "or a closely allied field" be added to Sect. IV, Part A.5, so that it reads: "Normally, the terminal degree in the field of specialty or a closely allied field from an accredited institution or equivalent attainment shall be the desirable qualification for tenure. . ." Vote for the addition was 28 for, 13 against, 12 abstentions.

B. Special Committee on Enrollment Quotas - D. Stubbs moved that

A Committee of the Academic Senate review the appropriateness of the present enrollment quota projections and the methods used to produce them. This review should include recommendations on at least the following factors:

1. Projected annual college growth including consideration of facilities, housing, etc.
2. Projected distribution of college enrollment by school, including consideration of statewide and regional program offerings and employment opportunities.
3. Distribution of FTE faculty by school and student faculty ratio by school.
4. Projected levels of enrollment for the College in terms of lower division, upper division and graduate.
5. Procedures for the implementation of enrollment quotas including considerations of changes of major.

Furthermore, it is resolved that this committee should propose a set of procedures by which the Academic Senate would review enrollment quota projections. These procedures should provide a timetable, list who is responsible for conducting the review and specify minimum information and criteria that are to be used. (See Attachment B, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

MSC (D. Stubbs, sec. J. Stuart) for adoption by a vote of 37 for, 2 against, 14 abstentions.

C. Instruction Committee - J. Rogalla moved that

The Academic Senate recommend to the President that the change of grade form include:

1. this statement: Responsibility for evaluating and reporting the performance of a student rests with the faculty member concerned. It is suggested that in considering a request for a change of grade the faculty member carefully evaluate the student's request within the framework of the integrity of the grading system and equity to the rest of the class, and
2. an additional copy be returned to the department in which the course was taught. (See Attachment C, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

MSC J. Rogalla, sec. H. Scales - for adoption by a vote of 35 for, 11 against, 7 abstentions.

V. Information Items

A. Report of the Student Affairs Committee - W. Boyce

Discussion followed an explanation by W. Boyce and P. Banke of a study being conducted by the committee in regard to student participation in

the evaluation of faculty members. Boyce announced that an open meeting of the committee will be held February 18, 1971, and that responses of Senators or constituencies should be sent to him before the meeting.

B. Report of the Statewide Academic Senate - D. Grant

In addition to noting that a summary will appear in the next Cal Poly Report, Senator Grant advised members that the Statewide Senate had approved the Library Budgeting plan and had taken exception to three of the issues presently backed by the Chancellor (tenure after six years instead of four, tenure procedures shall be limited to tenured members, tenure shall be granted to the upper two ranks only).

C. Report of the Academic Council Representative - J. Stuart

Senator Stuart noted that the Council had recently concerned itself with the two year college catalog plan and budget-full utilization matters. Stuart suggested that members confer with constituents in regard to Saturday classes and the 1½ hour versus 1 hour class times.

VI. Announcements

Chairman Alexander called attention to the identification tag system now in effect for Senate sessions. He referred to other announcements listed in the February 9, 1971 Agenda.

VII. MSC for adjournment at 4:35 p.m.

NOTE: The following corrections should be made on Agenda copies submitted to all members:

III. A. (See Attachment A, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

III. B. (See Attachment B, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

III. C. (See Attachment C, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

V. B. (See Attachment D, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

The Academic Senate California State Colleges requests that each faculty member in the State Colleges be given an opportunity to indicate approval or disapproval of the Academic Senate's Statement of Professional Responsibilities and Implementation of the Professional Responsibilities Statement.

Dr. Corwin Johnson was a member of the committee of the Academic Senate CSC that prepared the Statement of Professional Responsibilities; he has written a short history of the document and it is attached.

Copies of the Statement (4 pages) and the Implementation (2 pages) thereof are attached.

1. Please indicate your vote by placing marks in the appropriate boxes.
2. Fold the ballot so the name of the chairman of the Election Committee is on the outside, staple and place your ballot in the campus mail.

(Ballots must be received by the Election Committee by February 22 to be valid.)

I APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ☐

I DO NOT APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ☐

I HAVE NO OPINION. ☐

I APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ☐

I DO NOT APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ☐

I HAVE NO OPINION. ☐

Memorandum

o : Murray Smith, Chairman
Election Committee

Date : February 11, 1971

File No.:

Copies :

From : Corwin M. Johnson, Member, Faculty Affairs Committee
Academic Senate, California State Colleges

Subject: History of the Development of the Code of Professional Responsibilities and the
Procedures for Implementation.

During the summer of 1970, a number of groups and individuals came to the conclusion that a code of responsibilities or a code of ethics would be desirable for the faculty of the California State Colleges. One of the groups that discussed this was the Ad Hoc Committee for the Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty, whose membership is composed of Vern Graves, Chairman, Academic Senate, CSC; Charles Adams, Chairman, Faculty Affairs Committee, CSC; two trustees; and two college presidents. Vern Graves felt that there was a very definite need and he brought this subject to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, CSC. At their September 21, 1970, meeting they passed a resolution requesting that the Faculty Affairs Committee, of the Academic Senate, CSC, investigate and prepare a code of professional responsibilities or ethics and meet as often as necessary to have this ready for the December meeting of the Academic Senate, CSC.

The Faculty Affairs Committee considered this at their first meeting on October 14, 1970, and the entire Academic Senate endorsed the Executive Committee's resolution at their meeting of October 15-16, 1970. During this period, one of the trustee members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty introduced a resolution to the trustees, which was passed, requesting the State-Wide Academic Senate to prepare a code of professional conduct.

So, with the requests coming in from all quarters, the Faculty Affairs Committee met in November and twice in December and, at the December 17-18, 1970, meeting of the Academic Senate, presented a document which has now become known as the "Statement of Professional Responsibility and Procedures for Implementation" to the Academic Senate, CSC. This was accepted at the first reading with several suggestions for improvement. The Committee then made some changes in the document and decided that it should be divided into two sections. The first section was the statement of professional responsibilities which will require no action from the trustees, but is a code for the faculty of the California State Colleges. The second section was the procedures for implementation which would require the approval of the trustees. These two papers were presented to the Academic Senate, CSC, at their meeting of January 14-15, 1971, with the recommendation of the Committee that they be endorsed by the Senate and sent to the local campuses for ratification.

This recommendation was passed overwhelmingly by the Academic Senate, CSC, and the documents are now before you for ratification. The document on professional responsibilities is self-explanatory; however, a word is needed on the procedures

TO: Murray Smith, Chairman
Election Committee
DATE: February 11, 1971
PAGE: 2

for implementation. At the present time, when a breach of professional responsibilities occurs, the only action that can be taken is through the present "Disciplinary Action Procedures." It was felt by the Committee that there should be another step whereby a faculty member accused of a breach of professional responsibilities could be tried by his peers and a solution arrived at that is not as drastic as that under the "Disciplinary Action Procedures." It will be noted that if a solution cannot be reached with these procedures, one might still go to the "Disciplinary Action Procedures." However, it is felt by the Committee that most of the problems that have arisen could be solved by the less drastic means.

As a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Senate, CSC, I have worked on this since last October and have a rather bias outlook. However, I do think these documents are in the best interests of the faculties of the California State Colleges and hope that everyone will vote in favor of them.

AS-382-70/FA-I
12-17-70

A STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Academic freedom is a special freedom, necessary to the mission of professors in a college or university. Professional responsibility is its natural counterpart. As individuals, professors have the responsibility to conduct themselves in ways that will promote the achievement of the purposes for which academic freedom exists. To the extent that, as members of a profession, they have rights of self-government, professors as a group have an obligation to keep their houses in order and to take such steps as may be necessary to the fulfillment of their professional mission. A statement of professional responsibility may serve as a useful reminder of the variety of obligations assumed by members of the profession.

Teaching as a profession, and, specifically, teaching in institutions of higher learning, involves members throughout the nation and the world. As a consequence, a statement of professional ethics or responsibilities for teachers should enunciate principles which apply within the profession at large. Accordingly, the following statement is taken almost entirely from documents developed and published by the American Association of University Professors, some of them in conjunction with other well-known professional organizations. The core of this statement is the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. Additional items are taken from other statements alluded to in the Statement or promised in it--statements widely known and endorsed throughout the profession.

Though this statement brings together assertions of professional responsibility gleaned from several diverse documents variously developed during the past three decades, it is not exhaustive; it is at most only representative of major areas of responsibility. By means of footnotes this statement makes reference to materials which more fully develop the necessarily abbreviated representation of individual principles herein. Moreover, the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges pledges, as does the AAUP Council in its 1970 Statement on Freedom and Responsibility, to "encourage and assist local faculty groups seeking to articulate the substantive principles here outlined...".

STATEMENT

The responsibilities of a faculty member may be considered from five major perspectives: (1) as a member of the teaching profession; (2) as a teacher; (3) as a colleague; (4) as a part of an institution; (5) as a member of a community.

1. As a member of the teaching profession, the professor:

- a. seeks and states the truth as he sees it. (SPE)¹
- b. devotes his energies to developing and improving his scholarly competence. (SPE)

- c. accepts the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. (SPE)
- d. practices, fosters, and defends intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. (SPE AND SFR)²
- e. avoids allowing his subsidiary interests to hamper or compromise his freedom of inquiry. (SPE)³

2. As a teacher, the professor:

- a. encourages the free pursuit of learning in his students. (SPE)
- b. holds before his students the best scholarly standards of his discipline. (SPE)
- c. demonstrates respect for the student as an individual. (SPE)
- d. adheres to his proper role as an intellectual guide and counselor. (SPE)
- e. makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct. (SPE)
- f. makes every reasonable effort to assure that his evaluation of students reflects their true merit and is based on their academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance, whether personality, race, religion, degree of political activism, or personal beliefs. (SPE and SFR)
- g. respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. (SPE)⁴
- h. does not refuse to enroll or teach students on the grounds of their beliefs or the possible uses to which they may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. (SFR)
- i. refrains from forcing students by the authority inherent in the instructional role to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own part in society. (SFR)
- j. does not persistently intrude into the presentation of his subject material which has no relation to that subject. (SFR)
- k. presents the subject matter of his course as announced to his students and as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. (SFR)
- l. allows students the freedom to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in a course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion. (SFR)

- m. avoids any exploitation of students for his private advantage. (SPE)
3. As a colleague, the professor:
- a. respects and defends the free inquiry of his associates. (SPE)
 - b. shows due respect for the opinions of others in exchanges of criticism and ideas. (SPE)
 - c. acknowledges his academic debts. (SPE)
 - d. strives to be objective in his professional judgment of colleagues. (SPE)
4. As a member of an institution, the professor:
- a. seeks above all to be an effective teacher and scholar. (SPE)
 - b. observes the stated regulations of the institution provided they do not contravene academic freedom. (SPE)
 - c. maintains his right to criticize regulations and seek their revision. (SPE)
 - d. determines the amount and character of the work he does outside the institution with due regard for his paramount responsibilities within it. (SPE)
 - e. recognizes, when considering the interruption or termination of his services, the effect of his decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his intentions. (SPE)⁵
 - f. requests a leave of absence or resigns his academic position when acute conflicts between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience, on the one hand, and the claims and expectations of his students, colleagues, and institution, on the other, preclude the fulfillment of substantial academic obligations. (SFR)⁶
 - g. refrains from calling attention to grievances in ways that significantly impede the functions of the institution. (SFR)
 - h. accepts his share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his institution. (SPE)⁷
5. As a member of a community, the professor:
- a. measures the urgency of his obligations as a citizen in light of his responsibilities to his subject, his students, his profession and his institution. (SPE)
 - b. makes every effort, when he speaks and acts as a citizen, to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to show respect for the opinions of others, and to indicate that he does not speak for his college or university. (SPE AND SEU)⁸

- c. promotes conditions of free inquiry. (SPE)
- d. furthers public understanding of academic freedom. (SPE)

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Statement on Professional Ethics, the primary source of items in this statement. AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 1, Spring, 1969, pp. 86-87. Parenthetical references and footnotes identify documents from which items have been taken, most of them almost word-for-word.
- 2 AAUP Council Statement on Freedom and Responsibility, October 31, 1970.
- 3 See also AAUP statement "On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government--Sponsored Research in Universities" AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 51, No. 1, Spring, 1965, pp. 42-43.
- 4 An expanded statement of confidentiality is contained in "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students," esp. the section entitled "In the Classroom." AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 54, No. 2, Summer, 1965.
- 5 See also "Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members" and "A Report from Committee B, Late Resignation and Professional Ethics." AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 54, No. 3, Autumn, 1968, pp. 362-364.
- 6 See also "Statement on Professors and Political Activity," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 1, Autumn, 1969, pp. 388-389.
- 7 Such governance responsibilities are described somewhat in detail in "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter, 1966, pp. 375-379. See esp. Section V, "The Academic Institution: The Faculty."
- 8 "Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 51, No. 1, Spring 1965, p. 29.

FIRST READING

December 18, 1970

SECOND READING

January 1971

ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC

January 14, 1971

AS-382-70/FA-II
12-17-70

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATEMENT ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PROFESSIONAL SELF-DISCIPLINE

The fundamental purpose of a statement of professional responsibility is to establish a guide to responsible performance that is consistent with the highest ideals of the academic profession. It thus establishes an ideal to which faculty members can and should aspire, rather than a minimum standard to which faculty members must adhere. Hence, such a statement is not intended to serve primarily as a reference for disciplinary action. Nevertheless, when cases of gross disregard for principles of professional responsibility occur, the faculty has both a right and duty to call the lapse to the attention of the individual concerned and to expect that the irresponsible behavior will be discontinued.

Most departures from responsible professional behavior are likely to be minor lapses which can be corrected simply by calling the matter to the attention of the person involved. Ordinarily such matters are handled within the faculty member's academic unit.

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged which cannot be or is not, adequately handled thus informally within the basic academic unit, the matter should be taken up at the institutional level. Each college should have a Committee on Professional Responsibility. The members of such a committee should be chosen with special attention to the high regard in which they are held by the academic community. To this committee any member of the academic community may refer allegations of unprofessional conduct.

As quickly as may be feasible, the Committee on Professional Responsibility should begin an inquiry into the facts of any case it is asked to investigate. The Committee may at any time discontinue the inquiry because the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support the allegation. The Committee may also decide at any time that the case involves only minor matters which properly should have been referred to the basic academic unit for informal resolution and so refer it, with or without recommendations.

If the Committee on Professional Responsibility does carry its inquiry to completion, it should prepare a report which presents its conclusions and the basis for those conclusions. A copy of the report should go to the faculty member whose behavior was questioned and a copy to the person(s) requesting Committee consideration of the case, and a copy should be retained by the Committee. When in the judgment of the Committee the nature of the case suggests such a conclusion, the Committee may recommend the initiation of formal disciplinary action.

The intent underlying this procedure is to provide a mechanism whereby the faculty can call serious disregard for professional responsibility to the attention of an offending faculty member without the necessity of subjecting him to formal disciplinary action. It is expected that in most instances the weight of an adverse conclusion by the Committee on Professional Responsibility will bring about a correction of irresponsible behavior.

If grossly irresponsible behavior should continue, however, it may be necessary for the possibility of formal disciplinary action to be considered. Nevertheless, formal charges of unprofessional conduct should not be filed unless and until the corrective procedures outlined above have been tried. The college administrative officer who has general charge of disciplinary procedures should consult with the Committee on Professional Responsibility before proceeding with any disciplinary action based on charges of unprofessional conduct.

When formal disciplinary action is based on charges of unprofessional conduct, the faculty disciplinary action committee should be given the final determination as to whether sanctions should be imposed and the form they should take. Consideration should be given to a wide range of sanctions other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands, to provide a more versatile disciplinary response to various degrees and kinds of unprofessional behavior. But primary emphasis should be placed on preventive action. Apparent failures to meet professional responsibilities should be approached with a sustained attempt to inform, persuade, and improve; disciplinary action, regardless of the degree of sanction it may eventually suggest, should be a last resort.

FIRST READING

December 18, 1970

SECOND READING

January 1971

ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC

January 14, 1971

CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES IN
APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

- I. Principles applicable to all consultation in personnel actions:
- A. Full and meaningful faculty participation shall be involved as defined in each procedure.
 - B. Consultation shall be carried out with, and recommendations shall be made by, the lowest organizational unit practicable. Except where a clear disciplinary or other functional grouping occurs within a school or department, the lowest organizational unit would be the department. The department (or a school which does not have departments) shall decide whether to limit consultation to the discipline or functional grouping.
 - C. When departments or other organizational units, whether because of newness, size, leaves of absence or other similar reasons, are inadequate to make personnel recommendations, they may be assisted by other appropriate faculty. The decision to augment such a unit should be made only after consultation with the unit and other appropriate faculty bodies.
 - D. Recommendations and decisions shall be based only on professional competence, professional performance, and the educational needs of the specific department as well as of the College.
 - E. Administrative recommendations and decisions normally should concur, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, with the recommendations of the appropriate faculty unit or committee (specified in Section "B" above). When administrative recommendations and decisions are contrary to the recommendations of the faculty unit, or when they result from a choice between conflicting committee recommendations, explanation of the reasons should be conveyed in writing to the committees or units consulted. All persons making personnel evaluations and recommendations should be made aware that their evaluations and recommendations are subject to review by the person evaluated, administrators with personnel evaluation responsibilities, the Personnel Review Committee of the local Academic Senate, and a Grievance Committee if the recommended action is appealed.
 - F. Each department or other organizational unit shall develop, consistent with general college policy, its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. Both tenured and nontenured members shall be involved in the development of this statement. Each statement of criteria shall be approved by the President prior to implementation.

- G. A periodic review of the procedures and criteria shall be carried out by the department or unit at intervals to be determined by the department, but at least every three years. This review process shall include involvement of both tenured and non-tenured members.
- H. A prospective departmental member shall be mailed or given a copy of the written statement of procedures and criteria, not later than the initial offer of appointment.

II. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES (Applicable to both full-time and part-time faculty appointments.)

A. General Provisions

1. In the appointment of new faculty, every effort should be made to seek complete information and to evaluate thoroughly the backgrounds of individuals through such means as reference letters, telephone checks, personal interviews, etc. Whenever possible, it is desirable for the candidate to visit the campus and be interviewed by faculty members in his discipline before an offer is made.
2. Every candidate for a faculty position, before being offered an appointment, shall be informed of current opportunities and limitations with respect to retention, tenure, promotion, and working conditions.
3. When a faculty member is appointed with certain specific stipulations which do not circumvent established rules and regulations and which will prevail in later decisions on reappointment and/or tenure, these stipulations shall be included in the letter of offer.
4. Individuals to be appointed shall be acceptable to the majority of the tenured faculty of the department concerned except under conditions outlined in Section I-C and I-E above.
5. As early as possible in the course of communications and discussions regarding a position, a prospective appointee shall be clearly informed as to: (a) which person or persons have the authority to extend an actual offer of appointment and (b) whether or not the communication constitutes an actual offer of a position.

B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that because of the differences in the nature, size, or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the appointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Appointment Committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations?

- a. If so:
 - 1) Shall this committee consist of tenured faculty only?
 - 2) Shall there be non-tenured faculty on this committee?
If yes, of what rank?
 - 3) Shall there be a student on this committee?
 - 4) Shall there be one or more faculty members from each discipline on this committee?
 - 5) Should the department head serve on this committee?
 - b. If not, what faculty members should be consulted?
2. The functions of the Appointment Committee or consulted group should be made explicit, such as:
 - a. Should the consulted group recommend which disciplines, areas, and/or options need academic personnel?
 - b. Should the consulted group screen all initial letters and applications and recommend which shall be followed up?
 - c. Should the consulted group try to estimate the prospective appointee's teaching ability through a formal presentation?
 - d. How should the recommendations of the consulted group be handled?

III. REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

A. General Procedures

1. Each probationary faculty member, full time or part time, shall be evaluated at least annually, in accordance with the established timetable, by appropriate faculty and administrative personnel guided by the consultative principles expressed in Section I above. In the evaluative and consultative processes appropriate faculty should include tenured faculty members in the same discipline, organizational unit, or department and appropriate administrative personnel should include the department head or his equivalent.
2. The results of the consultative evaluation stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairman or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such statements shall include reasons in sufficient detail to validate recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.
3. Following each evaluation, the person evaluated shall be promptly informed by his department head of his apparent strengths, weaknesses, and prospects for future career in the department or school as indicated by the evaluation.
4. Faculty members to be reappointed shall be acceptable to a majority

of the tenured faculty of the department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Section I-C and I-E above.

5. All committees and administrators, other than the President, who review and make recommendations on reappointment or termination of a full-time faculty member shall be required to forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
6. If a termination recommendation is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If a termination recommendation is made first by the dean or division head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for termination shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
7. Notification of non-reappointment shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title V, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee is not required to routinely give written reasons for termination of non-tenured faculty, the faculty member may request, and shall receive, from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his termination.
8. Changes in criteria for reappointment shall not apply retroactively.

B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that, because of differences in the nature, size, or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the reappointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Reappointment Committee be charged with responsibility?
 - a. If so:
 - 1) What functions should the Committee have?
 - a) Evaluation of professional and teaching performance, research and creative activities, contributions to the institution and community, appropriate academic training or experience to perform the required duties? (Evidence for evaluation could include class visitation, review of outlines, tests, publications, and documents submitted by the person being evaluated. Peer opinion, alumni opinion, student opinion, and statements by the person being evaluated regarding his performance in any significant area could also be considered.)
 - b) Recommendation of reappointment or termination to appropriate administrators and committees?

2) How shall the Committee be constituted?

- a) Shall only tenured faculty of the same department and discipline be included?
- b) Shall non-tenured members be included? If so, what rank?
- c) Shall faculty members in the same department, but in another discipline, be included?
- d) Shall there be a student on the Committee?
- e) Shall the department head serve on this Committee?

b. If not, what faculty members should be consulted?

2. Additional questions for consideration:

- a. Should a resume of experience and accomplishments be required or requested from a faculty member being considered for reappointment?
- b. Should the evaluation statement by the initiating committee be provided directly to the faculty member upon request?

IV. TENURE PROCEDURES

A. General Procedures

- 1. Each faculty member eligible for tenure consideration shall be evaluated by his department head and the tenured members of his department according to established college-wide deadlines and consistent with the consultative procedures expressed in Section I above.
- 2. Responsibilities of all parties in the evaluation process include the following:
 - a. Faculty members being considered for tenure shall submit a resume of experience and accomplishments, giving valid reasons why tenure should be accorded, to those involved in the evaluation process. Such a resume shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.
 - b. Tenured faculty members and the department head shall, as a professional responsibility, make an effort to evaluate the professional competence and performance of their non-tenured colleagues so that they may assist, constructively, the evaluation process.
- 3. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairman or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such

statements shall include reasons in sufficient detail to validate recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.

4. Faculty members to be accorded tenure shall be acceptable to a majority of the tenured faculty of the department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Sections I-C and I-E above.
5. Normally, the terminal degree in the field of specialty or a closely allied field, from an accredited institution or equivalent attainment, shall be the desirable qualification for tenure. Equivalent attainment is accepted: (a) in those fields where the doctorate is not common, and (b) in vocational fields where experience may be substituted for academic training. Exception to this rule should be made only where a candidate shows exceptional competence and performance in teaching or other outstanding service to the academic community.
6. All committees and administrators other than the President who review and make recommendations on tenure shall forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons, shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
7. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made by the department head he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made first by the dean, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-tenure shall take place prior to review of the case by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
8. Notification of non-tenure shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title 5, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee is not required to routinely give written reasons for non-tenure, a faculty member may request and shall receive from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-tenure.
9. Changes in criteria for tenured appointment shall not apply retroactively.

B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the evaluation process?
 - a. Non-tenured colleagues?
 - b. One or more students on an advanced level?
 - c. Faculty members in other disciplines?
 - d. Alumni ?
2. Should a separate tenure committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so:
 - a. Should it receive and consider written recommendations from

the individuals determined in B-1?

- b. Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
 - c. How should they be appointed?
3. What additional functions should the tenure committee or consulted group have?
- a. Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
 - b. How shall their recommendations be presented?

V. PROMOTION PROCEDURES

A. General Provisions

1. Evaluation and associated consultation for promotion shall be carried out during the academic year prior to the first date of eligibility for promotion and in each subsequent year if not promoted.
2. The basic evaluation, for promotion, of the professional competence and performance in terms of the educational needs of the Department and the College shall be made by the individual's tenured colleagues of higher rank and the department head in accordance with the provisions of Section I above.
3. Faculty members eligible for promotion shall submit a resume or supplementary statement of experience and accomplishments which demonstrates evidence of promotability to those involved in the evaluation process. Such a resume or statement shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.
4. Consultation should be carried out with specific reference to approved criteria and standards developed and written down by the department and appropriate to the level of promotion. These criteria should be specific as to the following: (a) for which level of promotion the doctorate or other recognized terminal degree is a normal prerequisite and what exceptions may be applied and (b) whether promotion in rank may or may not occur prior to tenure and, if not, what exceptions may be applied.
5. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairman or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such statements shall include reasons in sufficient detail to validate the recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.
6. The recommendations of the department head normally should be in conformity with the recommendations of the faculty unit or committee consulted. If this is not the case, full explanation of the reasons for a contrary recommendation should be conveyed to the faculty unit or committee consulted, as well as the individual involved.

7. All committees and administrators other than the President who review promotion shall be required to forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendations. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
8. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made first by the dean or division head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-promotion recommendations shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
9. Although the President or his designee is not required to routinely give written reasons for non-promotion, the faculty member may request and shall receive, from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-promotion.

B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the promotional process?
 - a. Non-tenured colleagues?
 - b. One or more students on an advanced level?
 - c. Faculty members in other disciplines?
 - d. Alumni?
2. Should a separate promotion committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so:
 - a. Should it receive and consider written recommendations from the individuals determined in B-1?
 - b. Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
 - c. How should they be appointed?
3. What additional functions should the promotion committee or consulted group have?
 - a. Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
 - b. How shall their recommendations be presented?